

It's the Amerikan in me that makes me watch TV

see on the news this is what the man said, he said  
Ask not what you can do for your country --  
What's your country's been doing to you?..  
It's the Amerikan in me says it's an honor to die  
In a war that's just a politician's lie...  
It's the Amerikan in me that never wonders  
why Kennedy was erased by the FBI

From the Salon Magazine website came this comment on the band and the song: "And if their best number, 'The Amerikan in Me,' has that silly New Left spelling, it contains a line that can define the distance between the punks (and the fans and players who've followed in their spirit) and the '60s generation: 'Ask not what you can do for your country/Ask what your country's been doin' to you.' "

**[PART TWO in the next issue]**

(Many thanks to Gary Mack, Cliff Varnell, Eric Chomko, Tom Gill, Martin Shackelford, Howard Platzman, John McGill, Joe Simoules, Tracy Riddle, Walt Brown, Jerry Organ, and Jerry McLeer for their considerable contributions of material and suggestions for this article.)

## ASSASSINATION SCIENCE: A BOOK REVIEW

by Walt Brown

***Assassination Science: Experts Speak Out on the Death of JFK.***  
***Chicago: Catfeet Press, 1997. Edited by James H. Fetzer, Ph.D.***

*Assassination Science* is the kind of uneven, sometimes powerful, sometimes lackadaisical, "conspiracy" book that buffs will "love to hate." Given the brilliant essays by Dr. David Mantik and Dr. Charles Crenshaw, combined with a couple of reasonably well supporting pieces, this will be a prime book on your shelves in the "proof of conspiracy" department; at the same time, many readers may want to skip past the philosophical asides which attempt to garnish the main course in any or all future readings. In addition, it's far more of a "food for thought" volume than a conspiracy-related "case closed."

The book is a must because it adds to the growing literature of the third phase of the case: attack the minutiae; in the first few years after the assassination, researchers, plus a few dozen or so along for a quick buck who were never heard from again, attacked every syllable, sentence, and

conclusion in the Warren *Report*. And well they should have; from there, phase two involved the revelation of almost 300 strange and bizarre deaths that prevented "full disclosure" and served to keep the conspiracy and the lone nut theory in place and safe. In each of these phases, the official version was rehashed, defensively; ultimately, it came down to a simple postulate--if one of the Warren Commission criticisms was legitimate, or if one of the dead witnesses was a realistic extension of November 22, then the conspiracy was real.

Here is phase three: the Zapruder film. In several essays, the far best being by David Mantik, Ph.D., M.D., it is made clear that there are many anomalies in the Zapruder film, and the argument then runs, if the Z film is faked -- if any of the anomalies are real -- then we are back to a square one labeled "conspiracy."

That, in essence, is the thesis of the book: if the Z film is fraudulent, then it is the prima facie proof of governmental involvement in the coverup (all you might need to prove that is to read the Warren *Report*, but that is another story). On the way to the Z film discussion, however, one passes an argument by Dr. Crenshaw that the autopsy photos are fraudulent, and another by Mantik, that the autopsy x-rays are totally bogus. Those concepts weaken the book's central thesis, even if only by indirection. Both essays make strong arguments for governmental involvement in the coverup--and they are stronger evidence than anything that can be said about the Z film. The autopsy photos and x-rays were taken by the government, and have remained in government custody to this day; such copies that have leaked out have done so through investigators leaking them; on the other hand, the Zapruder film was taken by a private citizen and processed initially by private industry -- from there it went into government hands.

The photos and x-rays simply make a better case, and that is not to detract from the importance of what has been analyzed in the Z film -- the phase three noted above, beginning with smallish commentaries years ago, through Darryl Weatherly's analysis for Harrison Livingstone in *Killing Kennedy*, to date.

The concept of the book raises minor

hackles, suggesting either that science has not been used before, or that it is exclusively now, and both those thoughts are incorrect. Tink Thompson's *Six Seconds in Dallas* was a scientific *tour de force* in its day, but now we are learning that it was a powerful book on a fraudulent six foot piece of celluloid. George O'Toole's *The Assassination Tapes* was also a powerful scientific tome in its day, and in its own way, served as "proof" of governmental wrongdoing; so this new science is really just the old science--and it is not always "science": some of it is trite rehash -- particularly "Assassination Science and the Language of Proof," a concluding essay which contains arguments that have been around longer than David Belin's bowtie.

The other hackles are raised by the sobriquet "Experts" in the subtitle. Charles Crenshaw, despite whatever *JAMA* may think from day to day, was at Parkland Hospital, and was working on famous patients, on both November 22 and 24, and his commentary on the autopsy photos, matched with testimonies from many others who made observations similar to Crenshaw, is as persuasive as it was at the Liverpool symposium of 1996, when I walked through the audience with the photos and Crenshaw commented on what was wrong with each. David Mantik's two essays are nothing short of brilliant, and when I'm given "scientific" expertise by someone with both a medical degree and a Ph.D. in physics, I quickly become a good listener. Yet other "experts" cited have told us of three Oswalds (three *Marguerite* Oswalds too, yet, when one of that species constitutes a surplus), and a different "expert" has made media appearances to express the theory that the autopsy is inaccurate and misunderstood because the body being autopsied was that of J.D. Tippit, who, according to that "expert" was also in the limousine, next to Mrs. Kennedy, on Elm Street. "Expert" apparently is an easy status to achieve.

And once again, in this work filled with occasional outbursts of brilliance, even the experts fall out; David Mantik notes that the time frame in which the Zapruder film could have been altered -- from the time when



Abraham Zapruder and his partner viewed the movie about fifteen times on Saturday morning (one viewing involving Dan Rather, seeing JFK fall forward, which others have confirmed), until the WC needed it in late January 1964, is time enough to do the alterations necessary in Mantik's scenario; still another theory cited posits that the entire alteration of the film was accomplished in five hours. In that view, the film was flown to the capitol, processed, altered, and flown back to Dallas so that Zapruder, et al, could see it on Saturday morning. Thus, the home movie of the century was somehow "fixed" in five hours, spliced hundreds of times, frames excised, composite frames added, with intersprocket images added fraudulently, with certain markings added for register, with evidence of backward debris removed, and so that thirty plus years of observation could be fooled -- prior to the evaluation of the totality of the evidence being complete, and all in five hours prior to its return to Dallas. That "science" is difficult to accept.

Lastly, in the "hackles" department, it is not a matter of "experts" speaking out on the death of JFK; it's researchers and those who don't know better speaking out about the investigation into the death of JFK. This may seem a semantic pout, and it is, but when we are talking "science," let's be precise--and hopefully more precise and less philosophical than the editor of the work has been in his internet replies to questions about the book--such are philosophical and not scientific.

There are hundreds of morsels in the food for thought department here, and although space does not permit (nor would it be fair to co-opt the contributors' work -- go get the book...), a few of many samples will suffice; the reader can decide if the morsels should be kept or thrown to the fish.

The "Preface" on page xi begins with the statement, "The scientific evidence [Humes and Boswell] documented..." *So much for science*, I thought. We read in the Prologue, on page one, "Knowing the truth might even contribute to restoring our trust in government. And, if the government was involved..." *IF?*

The book then goes on to misname the

Warren Commission and add that the vast majority of the sealed evidence is still sealed, both egregious and basic factual errors for a book that claims to be scientific.

Dr. Robert Livingston's thoughts and work on the event(s) are cataloged in greater depth than heretofore, and his conclusions on his study of the JFK brain diagrams merit close attention.

Dr. Lattimer and JAMA get their due, noting that we have Dr. Gary Aguilar, an eye doctor, and the apologists had Lattimer, as we have an expert to help people see, and well, they have one to help people p\*\*. Needless to say, neither Lattimer's nor JAMA's reputations are enhanced by this work -- reason enough to grab it.

Page 33 makes the bold assertion that the backyard photos have been proved to be faked; there is the long-held assumption that they are fake, but proved? By whom? When?

Dr. Charles Crenshaw then uses original 1964 testimony, as well as 1978 repeat testimony, to buttress his arguments for faked autopsy photos, and Brad Kizzia goes after JAMA in his own way, and worth reading, as I was asked to testify in that case on behalf of Kizzia, Crenshaw, et al, and Kizzia did a magnificent job --both in this piece and in saving the truth in the case from the grasp of JAMA.

David Mantik's essays, both on the x-rays and the Zapruder film are brilliant, although I face a quandary because I believe the x-ray material more, but enjoyed the Zapruder discussion more, and learned more from it. This is also a result of my knowing absolutely nothing about photographic altering techniques, as I don't know an f-stop from a bus stop. But some of Mantik's anomalies just do not go away. Case in point: the crowd to the east of the Stemmons Freeway sign is animated in the Nix or Muchmore films; yet those same people are virtually unmoving in the Zapruder film.

David Mantik is profuse in his thanks to the many individuals who aided him in his work (which is continuing), and he adds a special note to Martin Shackelford, [a regular contributor here], as Martin is skeptical regarding Z film alteration; time permitting, we



shall ask Martin for a rebuttal to the alteration theories noted in *Assassination Science*.

There is also a wealth of material in the appendices, including a transcript of the comments of Dr. Malcolm Perry at the press conference on the afternoon of November 22, 1963. It is clear from Perry's words that he was asked questions and he answered them, including the statement that the wound through which he performed a tracheotomy was an entry wound. The Warren Commission tried to hatchet this press conference, and in their failures there is anything as nasty as any of the other alterations cited.

Add this one to your collection—see phase three for what it is, and don't be bothered by the infantile syllogisms.

### JFK/DPQ Science: The Case For Altered Autopsy Photos

*An additional commentary provoked by my  
reading of Dr. Fetzer's work*

by Walt Brown

I thought, before reading *Assassination Science*, that I had pretty much heard all the arguments for alteration, literally, of everything; after all, all the photos, the x-rays, all the known films, many FBI reports—it's all been altered, right?

I learned much from Dr. Fetzer's book, as noted in the accompanying review. But I have one additional thought worth sharing about the autopsy photos, and since I spent a lot of money to acquire the original Fox negatives to make copies available to researchers, and have argued loudly that the photos of the autopsy are fraudulent (see the photo section of *Treachery in Dallas*) thus, I feel the thought is worthy of all our consideration.

In fine, the photo gimmickry is, no pun intended, a "no-brainer." The photos we have seen show massive damage to the top of JFK's

head, along with a flap, not unlike a sizable lemon peel, hanging loosely in front of the right ear (a serious bit of damage which is not, however, in all the photos).

Then we read the testimony of those who saw the President after the shooting, from Mrs. Kennedy and Clint Hill, to the Parkland doctors and their assistants, to the ghouls at Bethesda and those around them who knew something about human anatomy, and finally, to the morticians.

One word more than any other seems to be the focal point of distinction in what all these folks who know enough medicine have said: cerebellum.

And that is the proof of the forgery of at least some of the autopsy photos. In the two superior poses, and in the photos showing an intact rear of the skull, there clearly is no cerebellum showing. The reason for that is elementary: given the damage depicted, there is no way possible that the cerebellum could be showing. Yet several doctors spoke of it, although as time passed, some have hedged just slightly.

That misses the point: given the damage shown in the photos, no doctor, no first year medical student, no bedpan jockey would ever say that a cerebellum could have extruded *from the wounds as shown*. It is like testifying that you saw a person with a badly lacerated kneecap, and the patient's pancreas was extruding. Anatomically, it just doesn't work. If the photos conformed at least reasonably to the testimony, which repeatedly has phrases like "occipitoparietal" or simply "back of the head," then cerebellum would at least be a possibility, and make a modicum of sense—and be worthy of considering or reconsidering as time passes. But as those pictures are right now, there is no way a cerebellum could have been hanging out of those depicted wounds, and certainly no doctor worth his sphygmomanometer would ever have said so.

Beyond that, and please, let's not have any "you can't see the back of the head wound because the scalp was pulled up to cover it" nonsense, what do you think?